



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/723,908 | 11/26/2003 | Peter Andersen | 0459-0752P | 5514 |
| 2292 7590 04/27/2009 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| SWARTZ, RODNEY P | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 1645 | | | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 04/27/2009 | | ELECTRONIC | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/723,908

Applicant(s)

ANDERSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Rodney P. Swartz, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1645

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rodney P. Swartz, Ph.D., primary examiner.(3) Mary Eliason, Reg. No. 58,303.(2) Leonard R. Svensson, Reg. No. 30,330.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 April 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes

e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: claims of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed proposed claim language to obviate the remaining indefiniteness rejections. Suggestions included "wherein said substantially pure polypeptide", "at least 7 consecutive amino acids", "at least 11 consecutive amino acids", "at least 101 consecutive amino acids" and "an oligopeptide". The proposed changes appear to place the claims into better form for allowance. Examiner will await a formal Response from applicants..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Rodney P. Swartz, Ph.D./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645